

MONTGOMERY COUNTY SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, January 22, 2025 – 5:30 – 7:30pm
MEETING NOTES

SWAC members in attendance:

Amy Maron, Chair	Oladapo Awe
Robin Barr, Vice Chair	Mark Symborski (M-NCPPC rep, non-voting)
Kavita Battula, Secretary	Troy Cavell
Chaz Miller	John Meyer III
Fred Kranz	Lauren Greenberger
Michelle Ennis	Kaela Martins
Andrew Cassilly	Barry Shanoff
Chaz Miller	Pradip (Peter) Mukerjee
Dawn Sellis	

SWAC Members absent: None

DEP Officials in attendance:

Jon Monger, Director, DEP
Jeff Seltzer, Deputy Director, DEP
Willie Wainer, Chief, Recycling and Resources Management Division
Lisa Shine, Executive Administrative Assistant to the RRMD Division Director
David Frank, Technical Liaison to SWAC

Guests

B&L: Steven Lezinsky: VP, Mid-Atlantic Operations
Arcadis: Steve Nesbit, Project Manager; Bill Jansen (rail expert)

Members of the public

Mike Ewall, Elisabeth Fiidler, Susan Eisendrath, B. Preston Lyles, Ryan Clancy

Jon Monger: DEP is seeking to extend the contract for the Resource Recovery Facility (RRF) to allow for consideration of alternatives.

Arcadis presentation (Steve Lezinski)

Continuity and Complexity of Operations

- Extension. 5 year extension to April 2031 required for continuity of operations, will include early termination clause
- Schedule. Implementation timelines for alternative MSW management systems such as MRBT with scheduled long-haul to an out-of-county landfill (LF) would have 5-6 year duration depending on procurement and capital project start dates. Significant rolling stock (i.e., rail cars and/or trucks) purchases with staging space would also need to be accommodated at the TS and RRF based on the selected long-haul option.

- Operations. If alternative MSW management systems were selected, implementation would trigger the relocation of existing operations and site infrastructure modifications under multiple complex capital projects occurring in parallel at the Transfer Station and RRF based on the selected long-haul option.
- Costs. Along with the short-term extension of the RRF and TS operating agreement, there are significant costs associated with transitioning to alternative MSW management systems. Costs need to be evaluated along with other factors including but not limited to potential impacts to public health and the environment, social equity and environmental justice, and regulatory acceptance, among others. Costs will be discussed with SWAC at a future briefing.

Implementation Timelines for Alternative MSW Management Systems

- A chart showing the implementation for timelines for each of 5 different possible scenarios demonstrate the need for RRF contract extension.

Long Haul Options with Case Study Option 2E

- Arcadis looks at 5 long haul options:
 - 2A: use existing rail cars to move waste from TS to RRF as a staging area, then send waste to LF by different rail route (using CSX).
 - 2B: all waste moved by rail to LF directly from TS.
 - 2C: all waste moved by truck to LF directly from TS.
 - 2D: 65 percent of waste by rail from TS to LF. 35% by truck from TS to LF.
 - 2E: 100% of waste from TS to RRF, then to LF via truck (newest option).
- Emergency vs planned long-haul
 - o Baseline: Planned includes RFP procurement, design, permit, and construction of infrastructure improvements, rolling stock pre-purchase, and tractor trailers with walking floors for transport.
 - o Operational Conditions: Planned includes redesign of TS building, rail yard, operational and staging areas and rail modifications; local and regional roadway improvements; nuisance mitigation; procurement; design and permitting, construction, and rolling stock manufacturing.
 - o Route Conditions: planned has 160-170 miles travel distance which is a 9-hour cycle time, versus 37 miles and 2-hour cycle time for unplanned route to Lorton RRF.
 - o Both will include tractor trailers with walking floors for transfer
- Cycle Time Review
 - o Potential facilities are Waste Management in VA (160 mi) or Republic in either KY or OH (350 mi)
 - o Transportation via trailer and railcar (CSX): hours vs. days
 - o Staging time required to stack cars, load and unload. Long haul to VA is at least 8 days for WM and 12 for Republic
- Long Haul Options – Major Capital Projects:
 - o 2A RRF (Rail) county purchases containers and railcars and makes significant track improvements (Timeline 54-60 months).

- 2B TS (Rail) requires staging to longer trail lengths, and the size of the rail station at the TS is not large enough. There are two bridges in the way that would have to be reconstructed (Timeline 54-60 months).
- 2C TS (Truck) increased truck traffic raises safety concerns, would have to purchase walk-in trailers (Timeline 54-60 months).
- 2D (hybrid) & 2E (hybrid) would require walk-in floor trailers (hybrid), requires specialty rolling stock, staging, extensive construction, studies and design (7 years) (Timeline 54-60 months).
- 2E in detail covers all the modification required by various options (Timeline 54-84 months)
- Route from SG to Hyattsville – navigate pedestrians, historic bridge clearance, road improvements, restoration of wetlands, reinforce pavement
- Federal and state environmental and historic preservation permitting process alone requires 3 years

Next Steps

- Scheduled briefings: Council briefing, DAFIG briefing, Council public hearing for update to 10-year SWMP; Planning briefings: SCA briefing, ZWMC briefing, other various briefings (Feb-Mar 2025).
- Deliverables: Arcadis evaluation model/preliminary analyses (Feb-Mar 2025).

Q/A

- Q: Can you please clarify the cycle times? It's not clear what these demonstrate. A: Cycle times for car vs rail isn't for a comparison (akin to apples-to-oranges), but for calculation of costs
- Q: What is the volume comparison of trucks to railcars? A: Rolling stock analysis not included in this presentation.
- Q: Did you look at extending the railyard at Dickerson? How much is it relative to Transfer Station? A: Much less expensive due to bridge construction.
- Q: Can you transfer by truck to the RRF then long-haul? A: Yes, that was examined. Rail for both was examined for purposes of comparison data.
- Q: Have you considered the environmental impacts of the different options? A: This study is more preliminary; it does make clear that the environmental permitting for trucks is extensive.
- Q: Any heavy-duty utility relocations required? A: Yes (e.g. power lines for truck hauls).
- Q: Is rail more economical for longer distance? A: Yes. Dollar per ton per mile was calculated.
- Q: Examples of any comparably-sized cities in North America using trucks for long-distance hauls? A: Very likely but cannot recall specific ones at the moment.
- Q: Is there still a commercial driver shortage? A: Yes, we will need vendors to demonstrate that they can provide drivers
- Q: Why are costs not included in the presentation? A: The timelines are fixed, so that is the focus here – justification of the time extension.
- Q: When will there be cost estimates? A: RFP will help us understand costs, Council approval, including the budget, is in the spring.

- Q: Any idea of when there might be an RFP? A: Target is spring 2025. Arcadis is wrapping up updates based on procurements and comments on draft, which will need final review and coordination.
- Q: 2A seems like the most feasible, but the slides don't necessarily make this clear. Is that a correct interpretation? A: Yes, that is correct; there is a lot of information, and we will add a summary to make this clear.
- Q: Will there be a discussion of MRBT? A: This was discussed and will be further evaluated when RFP responses come back
- Q: Are you looking at existing MRBT facilities in North America? A: Yes, and some of those facilities have responded to the REOI.
- Q: How many tons per day are in the scenarios? A: About 1800 tons per day.
- Q: Why would we consider anaerobic digestion? A: Because the organic waste would be converted to fuel, to provide an economic basis (revenue) for the project
- Q: Should we be pursuing anaerobic digestion, due to environmental impacts (methane production)? A: RFP will require/include a more detailed analysis by design engineer.

Updates from Willie Rainer, RRMD

- Arcadis presentation captures why the RRF simply can't just be shut down.
- Trash/recycling delays due to weather and holiday, next week should be on schedule. Trucks are large with big loads, so safety is a consideration.
- Transfer station crews worked overnight before the inclement weather so the station would be operable
- Three new scales now at the transfer station (inbound); demolition of old scale house required and have moved workers to a different location.
- There will be new scale house and admin parking lot constructed. Everything will be automated with kiosks (credit card capacity).
- First phase expected completion mid-April; full completion expected at end of summer.
- Transfer station and materials processing facility signs have been updated so customers know where to go.
- Two new programs at the transfer station
 - o mattress recycling: 1600-1700 tons projected in FY25 (compared to 391 tons in 24); compactor jams have been reduced by 65-70%
 - o plastic bags and film recycling: initially contamination was an issue, but this has improved significantly with the presence of an attendant to assist/educate residents
 - o bags are being sent to TREX; (no revenue now but may happen in the future, similar to electronics recycling)

Update on MRF building capital improvement project from Steve Lezinski

- The project is now in the 30% design phase, which is due to be completed at end of February.
- Projected reduction of workers by 60-90%, but possible to reassign them.

- The new project will allow glass to be separated out earlier. We are looking at new options to recycle glass such as into cement or concrete.

Approval of December 2024 minutes at 7:33.

Next meeting is Feb. 12. Hope to have Marilyn Belcombe, who represents Dickerson, to speak on consolidating trash collection districts.

No public comments or questions.

Amy requested SWAC members to help come up with ideas topics for future meetings.

Meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm.

ACRONYMS

AD	Anaerobic Digestion
C&D	Construction and Demolition
CC	County Council
CE	County Executive
CNG	Compressed Natural Gas
CPI	Consumer Price Index
DAFIG	Dickerson Area Facilities Implementation Group
DEP	Department of Environmental Protection
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FTE	Full Time Employee
FY	Fiscal Year
MDE	Maryland Department of the Environment
MC	Montgomery County
MES	Maryland Environmental Services
MRF	Materials Recovery Facility
MML	Maryland Municipal League
MCPS	Montgomery County Public Schools
MRBT	Material Recovery and Biological Treatment
OLO	Office of Legislative Oversight
PAYT	Pay-As-You-Throw
RRF	Resource Recovery Facility
RRMD	Recycling & Resource Management Division
SA	Service Area for County collection
SAYT	Save-As-You-Throw
SCA	Sugarloaf Citizens Association
SF	Single-family
SWAC	Solid Waste Advisory Committee
SWMP	Solid Waste Management Plan
T&E	Transportation and Environment Committee

TPD Tons per Day
TPW Tons per Week
ZWTF Zero Waste Task Force